

thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes I will put none of the diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians; for I am the Lord that healeth thee." Again in Deut. 7: 15, we read, "And the Lord will take away from thee all sickness." This was to be a recompense for faithfulness. In Deut. 28, we learn that if the Israelites were disobedient every known disease was to come upon them. Yes, says some one, that was away back in the wilderness when the Lord was preparing his people for the promised land. Is he any less preparing his people for the promised land? Complete obedience to the Lord will bring about the same result now, if he is UNCHANGEABLE.

In Isaiah's prophecy 53: 4, we have this language: "Surely he has borne our sicknesses and carried our pain; this is the literal rendering as all scholars except theologians, will admit. The standard German has it, *Krankheiten und Schmerzen*. This rendering is also evident from the fact that in the 5th verse the prophet says, "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities." In the two separate verses the prophet, in poetic language refers to two different things; in the 4th to sickness and pain, and in the 5th to sin and iniquity. If there is a promise of atonement for sin, and iniquity in the 5th verse, there is a promise of atonement for sickness and pain in the 4th. The language is just as clear, as pointed, and as definite in one as in the other, and none but theologians and skeptics will undertake to interpret one literally and the other figuratively. The prophet himself settles the question by saying that "the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes are we healed." That is to say, we have peace because he was chastised; we are healed because he was afflicted.

It is not necessary to refer to the fact that Christ fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah concerning himself, in *his day* and generation, both as to the pardon of sin, and the healing of diseases, neither is it necessary to state that the pardon of sin extends to *this day* and generation, but somehow or other the great body of the church labors under the delusion that the power of healing the body ceased with the Apostles. I affirm without fear of successful contradiction, that there is not one passage of scripture, from the first page of Genesis, to the last verse of Revelation to justify such a conclusion; but there are many passages to the contrary; the most significant among them is the language of the Savior himself recorded in Mark 16: 16-18, just before he closed his earthly ca-

reer, which reads as follows: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned, and these signs shall follow them that believe. In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." This promise is not only to the Apostles, or to the Apostolic age, but to all that BELIEVE, or have saving faith. It is astonishing and lamentable that notwithstanding such a clear and positive declaration made by the Son of God himself, that there should be the raving and denunciation of this clearly taught, and beneficent truth that we find in the world to-day. I can attribute it to but one source which is the devil, he being the author of sickness as well as of sin.

In I Cor. 12: 4-8, we have this clear and pointed declaration. "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administration, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the spirit is given to every man to profit withal." Paul follows up the foregoing language by naming the various gifts of the spirit, and at the close of the chapter exhorts his brethren to earnestly covet the best gifts. The idea that the gifts of the spirit were only available to the church of Corinth or the Apostolic church is pure presumption; there is not one word in scripture to justify such a conclusion. If the 12th chapter of I Cor. was only intended for the Apostolic church every other chapter of that book, or letter would only apply to that age, and would have no significance to us. Surely our brethren would not admit such to be the case. Let us be consistent and accept or reject the whole.

There is no one blessing more clearly foreshadowed in prophecy, more completely exemplified, and plainly taught by Christ and the Apostles than divine healing, and when our brethren will once insist upon the same literal interpretation of those passages of scripture that relate to the healing of diseases, as they do those that relate to ordinances of the church, there will be a new life, and a new power spring up in our beloved church; and when they will rumage history for instances of divine healing as they rumage it for evidence of trine immersion and foot-washing, they will become convinced that the great boon of life and health in Christ was not only confined to the Apostolic age, but has been extant in the world

through all the centuries of our blessed dispensation.

I trust that this article, though imperfectly prepared may move our elders to study the WORD more carefully upon this subject than they have heretofore done, and bring themselves in such close touch with God, through Christ, and the Holy Spirit that they can *effectually* officiate in the sick room as the Apostle James would have them do.

It is not expected that every prayer for the sick will be immediately answered, any more than every prayer for sinners, yet we do not cease praying for them because some are not saved. Many that are baptized are not saved, yet we do not cease baptizing on that account. We should pursue the same course in anointing with oil for the healing of the sick, it is commanded and we have no authority to disregard one commandment any more than another.

#### THE SPIRIT OF THANKFULNESS.

PHILIP S. MOXOM, D. D.

Probably most persons would admit that thankfulness is a virtue, and that they ought to be thankful for the divine mercy and beneficence. But it also is probable that comparatively few have a true and adequate idea of this virtue and obligation.

There are many curious misunderstandings in the common mind with reference to primary Christian virtues. Take, for example, meekness. This is, perhaps, the most misunderstood and the least appreciated of the virtues. Many who covet the appellation "generous" or "courageous," or even "patient" would resent being called "meek." This is because meekness, in the popular thought, is identified with want of spirit, with feebleness, and even with cravenness. Yet Moses is characterized as meek, and Jesus, when inviting men to follow and imitate himself, spoke of himself as "meek and lowly in heart."

The study of examples like these leads us to see that meekness is consonant with the greatest strength of will and force of character. Meekness is the absence of egotism. It is the power to live in that unconsciousness of self which is pre-eminently the mark of a morally great nature. It is capacity to keep sweet and gentle and firm despite whatever assaults may be made on one's temper. It is self-respect without self-conceit, and self-defense without self-assertion. Meekness is rightfully called one of the passive virtues, yet its possession presupposes a high degree of moral energy. So true is this that the really weak man cannot be meek.